

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/082,590 | 02/23/2002 | Randall E. Carter | PTC-001-005 | 5693 |
| 23451 | 7590 11/24/2003 | • | EXAMI | NER |
| ROBERT R HUSSEY CO., LPA | | | DOUGLAS, STEVEN O | |
| P O BOX 400 NORTH OLMSTED, OH 440700400 | | | , ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | • ′ | 3751 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003 | |
| | | | | / |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | • | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
| Office Action Summary | | 10/082,590 | CARTER ET AL. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Steven O. Douglas | 3751 | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt - Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. o period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| 1)[🛛 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 S | eptember 2003. | | | | |
| 2a)□ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□ | ✓ Claim(s) 1-10,12-24 and 27-33 is/are pending in the application. ✓ 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ✓ Claim(s) 1-10 and 27-33 is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 12-24 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) is/are objected to. ✓ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| · | ion Papers | i election requirement. | | | | |
| | | or. | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| . • / 🗀 | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| * 5 13) | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest ince a specific reference was included in the first CFR 1.78. A) The translation of the foreign language process of the priority of the foreign language proces | ts have been received. Its have been received in Applicate of the certified copies not received in Applicate of the certified copies not receive its priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1190 of the sentence of the specification of the certified copies not receive its priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1200 ovisional application has been received its priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 1200 ovisional application has been received in the certification of the specification of the priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 1200 ovisional application has been received in Application has been received in Application ovisional application has been received in Application has been received in Application ovisional application has been received in Applica | ion No ed in this National Stage ed. e) (to a provisional application) r in an Application Data Sheet. ceived. and/or 121 since a specific | | | |
| Attachmer | | _ | | | | |
| 2) Notic | ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>8</u> | 5) 🔲 Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/082,590

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-21,23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admission (see unnamed reference provided in the IDS filed 9-17-03).

Applicant's admission discloses a device which dispenses pressurized sealant comprising body 12 with associated locking tabs 20 (in as much as Examiner can ascertain from the drawings it appears that the body is *one-piece*) and a locking sleeve 14, but does not disclose the body and locking sleeve as being comprised of plastic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the body and locking sleeve of plastic, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a

Art Unit: 3751

known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.*

In regard to claims 23 and 24, the method as claimed would be inherent during the normal use and operation of the device.

Conclusion

Claims 1-10 and 27-33 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven O. Douglas whose telephone number is 703-308-0891. The examiner can normally be reached on Wed-Fri 6:30-7:00.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0461.

Steven O. Dolglas Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

SD 11-17-03